

# TRUE AMERICAN.

P. B. CONN, PUBLISHER,  
CORNER MARKET AND 4TH STS.

\$2 PER ANNUM,  
INVARIABLY IN ADVANCE.

A Weekly Journal, Devoted to American Interests, Literature, Science, and General Intelligence.

Z. RAGAN, Editor and Proprietor.

STEUBENVILLE, OHIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1855.

VOLUME I.—NUMBER 8.

## SPEECH OF Hon. W. R. Smith, of Alabama.

The Naturalization Laws—The Roman Catholic Church.

(CONCLUDED.)  
EARLY HUMILITY OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOPS.

In the earlier history of the Roman Catholic Church, the bishops were meek and lowly men, after the fashion of Peter and Paul, the fisherman and tent maker. They professed to be the servants of servants. For six or seven centuries they preserved their character for Christian humility. I here quote from Bowers, the author of an elaborate work—the Lives of the Popes. He was a Catholic himself when he began the work, but became a Protestant in the course of his investigations. He was not only a Catholic, but a councillor of the inquisition at Nacera. He says:

"I do not believe that the Popes designed at first to run those lengths, or carry the Papal prerogative to that extravagant height they afterwards did. The success that attended them in the pursuit of one claim encouraged them to set up and pursue another. Of this no one can doubt who peruses, with the least attention, the records of those ages, and compares the Popes in the beginning of the seventh century with the Popes in the latter end of the eleventh. We shall find them in the first mentioned period of time, submitting, with all humility, to princes, claiming no authority or jurisdiction whatsoever, but in virtue of the canons of councils, or the rescripts of Emperors; glorying, or pretending to glory, in the humble title of servants of servants; acknowledging themselves subjects and vassals of the Emperors, and patiently waiting the will and pleasure of their liege lords, to take upon them the Episcopal dignity, or exercise the functions of that office. Such were the Bishops of Rome in the beginning of the seventh century. How different from those in the latter end of the eleventh! They were then vested with the plenitude of all power, both spiritual and temporal; above councils, and uncontrollable by their canons; the fountain of all pastoral jurisdiction and authority; and by Divine sanction, empowered to enact, establish, abrogate, suspend, all ecclesiastical laws and constitutions; they were then become lords and masters—the most haughty and imperious lords, the most severe masters mankind had ever groined under. They no more begged, but dispensed titles, boasting a power of setting up Kings, and pulling them down at pleasure; of calling them to an account, absolving their subjects from allegiance, divesting them of their dominions, and treating, in every respect, as their slaves and vassals, those whom one of their best and greatest predecessors had acknowledged superior to all men, and thought himself in duty bound to obey. This plenitude of power, as they style it, was not acquired at once, but by degrees, some of the Popes being more and some less active, crafty and aspiring. But what is very remarkable of the one hundred and fourteen Popes between Boniface III., who laid the foundation of Papal grandeur, and Gregory VII., who raised it to the highest pitch, not one ever lost an inch of ground his predecessor had gained. And thus, by constantly acquiring, and never parting with what they acquired, and by tying the hands of their successors by the irreversible entail of Divine right, they became the sole spiritual lords, and had almost made themselves the greatest temporal lords of the whole of the Christian world."

GRADUAL RISE OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

For seven hundred years, as I have stated, the Bishops were meek and lowly men. It was in the dark ages, when ignorance and superstition overshadowed the world when the Popes advanced to power. And it was not until the days of Gregory VII., in the eleventh century, that a Pope had the audacity to say to a monarch: "You have forfeited your kingdom, and your subjects are absolved from their oath of fealty." In the case of Henry IV., the Pope declared, that the "Emperor was amenable to the Papal court of judicature," before he was summoned. He was next

deprived of his throne, and his subjects were absolved from their oath of allegiance! The Pope claimed the right to depose of Henry's empire, with absolute authority as a fief of St. Peter! This case was referred to and detailed and justified by the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. Chandler.] The same gentleman admits:

"Undoubtedly, the Pope has proceeded to dethrone Kings, and thus to release subjects. History declares that more than one monarch has been made to descend from his throne by the edict of the Popes, and that the allegiance of his subjects has been transferred, by that edict, to a succeeding monarch."

This is an admission—the argument would be quite sufficient for our purpose. But before I proceed to reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I propose to establish the historical fact, that for six or seven hundred years, the Bishops of Rome (the Popes) have claimed and exercised the right—as a divine right—to depose monarchs, and to absolve their subjects.

In 663, the Emperor Constant, went to Rome, the Pope went out six miles, with all his clergy, to meet him, and attended him, during his stay in Rome, as his lord and master. But in 1161, Henry II., and Louis of France, "met the Pope, and they gave him such marks of respect that they both dismounted to receive him, and holding each of them, one of the reins of his bridle, walked on foot by his side, and conducted him in that manner into the castle—a spectacle to God, angels, and men, and such as had never before been exhibited to the world."

About this period, began the serious disturbances between the Kings of England and the Pope. Hume says:

"The usurpation of the clergy, which had at first been gradual, were now become so rapid, and had mounted to such a height that the contest between the regal and pontifical was really arrived at a crisis in England, and it becomes necessary to determine whether the King or the Priests, particularly the Archbishop of Canterbury, should be sovereign of the kingdom."

THE WAR BETWEEN THOMAS A. BECKET AND HENRY II.

The memorable history of this struggle cannot fail to be interesting, as well as profitable, in this investigation. Henry had appointed Becket Archbishop of Canterbury. Becket had made himself a favorite with the Kings as well as with the people.

"The pomp of his retinue, the sumptuousness of his furniture, the luxury of his table, the munificence of his presents, exceeded anything that England had ever before seen in any subject."

"But no sooner was Becket installed in this high dignity, which rendered him, for life, the second person in the kingdom with some pretensions of aspiring to be the first, than he totally altered his demeanor and conduct, and endeavored to acquire the character of sanctity. He wore sackcloth next his skin, which, by his affected care to conceal it, was necessarily the more remarked by all the world. He changed it so seldom, that it was filled with dirt and vermin. His usual diet was bread, his drink water. He tore his back with the frequent discipline which he inflicted on it; he daily, on his knees, washed, in imitation of Christ, the feet of thirteen beggars, whom he afterwards dismissed with presents; he gained the affections of the monks by his frequent charities to the convents and hospitals; and all men of penetration plainly saw that he was meditating some great design, and that the ambition and ostentation of his character had turned itself towards a new and more dangerous object."

"Becket waited not till Henry should commence those projects against the ecclesiastical power. He was himself the aggressor, and endeavored to overawe the King by the intrepidity and boldness of his enterprises."

"The ecclesiastics in that age had renounced all immediate subordination to the magistrate; they openly pretended to an exemption in criminal accusations from a trial before courts of justice; and were gradually introducing a like exemption in civil causes; spiritual penalties alone could

be inflicted on their offences; and, as the clergy had extremely multiplied in England, and many of them were, consequently, of very low characters, crimes of the deepest dye, murders, robberies, adulteries and rapes were daily committed with impunity, by ecclesiastics. It had been found, for instance, that no less than a hundred murders had, since the accession of the King, been perpetrated by men of that profession, who had never been called to account for these offences; and holy orders were become a full protection for all these enormities."—Hume.

Henry, however, persevered, until he procured the enactment of the constitutions of Clarendon, in which he gained a signal victory over all the English ecclesiastics, except the invincible Becket, who refused obedience to the constitutions of Clarendon, until, abandoned by all the world, he was obliged to submit, and to promise "legally, with good faith, and without fraud or reserve." But Henry was still baffled. He sent his constitutions of Clarendon to Pope Alexander, "and required that Pontiff's ratification of them; but Alexander condemned them in the strongest terms—abrogated, annulled, and rejected them."

Becket then repented of his consent; "and endeavored to engage all the other Bishops in a confederacy to adhere to their ecclesiastical privileges. Henry, informed of Becket's present dispositions, applied to the Pope that he should grant the commission of legate in his dominions, but Alexander, as politic as he, though he granted the commission, annexed a clause that it should not empower the legate to execute any act in prejudice to the Archbishop of Canterbury." The King, however, persevered until he triumphed over Becket, for the primate was "condemned of a contempt of the King's court, and as wanting in the fealty which he had sworn to his sovereign; all his goods and chattels were confiscated."

But this war still raged between the King and Becket. The Primate defied the King. "He put himself and his See under the protection of the supreme Pontiff." About this time Becket fled from the kingdom, and was received by the Pope with the greatest marks of distinction. He was not idle in his banishment.

But it is fruitless, and a waste of time, to give all the details of this quarrel; yet it created more intense interest and excitement in Europe than had ever, or has ever, been felt in any of those great wars, in which armies annihilated each other! Finally, plenipotentiaries on both sides were appointed to negotiate a treaty of peace! And the King had to surrender his pretensions, in order to relieve his Ministers from the sentence of excommunication, which Becket, even in his exile, had thundered against them! Here is a history of the terms of the treaty.

"Becket was not required to give up any rights of the church, or resign any of those pretensions, which had been the original ground of the controversy. Becket and his adherents were to be restored to all their livings, and even the possessors of such benefices, as had been filled during the Primate's absence, should be expelled, and Becket have liberty to supply the vacancies. In return for concessions which entrenched so deeply on the honor and dignity of the Crown, Henry reaped only the advantage of seeing his Ministers absolved from the sentence of excommunication, and of preventing the interdict which, if these hard conditions had not been complied with, was ready to be laid on all his dominions. So anxious was Henry to accommodate all differences, and to reconcile himself fully with Becket, that he took the most extraordinary steps to flatter his vanity, and even, on one occasion, humiliated himself, so far as to hold the stirrup of that haughty prelate when he mounted."

Here you see, sir, in the twelfth century, a shining instance of the complete triumph of the power of the Pope over the haughtiest and most powerful monarch in Europe. And the supreme autonomy of the Archbishops is strikingly illustrated in the fact, that no sooner had Becket returned to his diocese, than he began thundering his excommunications against his enemies, so lately "the King's friends and coadjutors."

What is an excommunication? The excommunication of a King, the interdict of a kingdom, is illustrated in the history of King John, the son of Henry II. The power and authority which the Archbishop of Canterbury had acquired, by Becket's triumph over Henry, shows itself in the next reign; and the King and kingdom of England are placed under interdict, the effect of which may be seen by the following historical account of it.

"The nation was, of a sudden, deprived of all exterior exercise of its religion; the altars were despoiled of their ornaments; the crosses, the reliques, the images, the statues of the saints, were laid on the ground, and, as if the air itself were profaned, and might pollute them by its contact, the Priests carefully covered them up, even from their own approach and veneration. The use of bells entirely ceased in all the churches; the bells themselves were removed from the steeples and laid on the ground, with the other sacred utensils; mass was celebrated with shut doors, and none but the priests were admitted to that holy institution. The laity partook of no religious rite, except baptism to newly born infants, and the communion to the dying. The dead were not interred in consecrated ground; they were thrown into ditches, or buried in common fields; and their obsequies were not attended with prayers, or any hallowed ceremony. Marriages were celebrated in the churchyard; and that every action of life might bear the marks of this dreadful situation, the people were prohibited the use of meat, as in lent, or times of the highest penance; were debarred from all pleasures and entertainments, and even to salute each other, or so much as to shave their beards and give any decent attention to their person and apparel. Every circumstance carried symptoms of the deepest distress, and of the most immediate apprehension of divine vengeance and indignation."

Such is the force and power of an interdict; it can be better imagined than described.

In the excommunication of a King, all his adherents are included. John was excommunicated; and the sentence proceeded to absolve all John's subjects from their oaths of fidelity and allegiance, and to declare every one excommunicated who had any commerce with him, either in public or in private! In vain did King John attempt to hold out against the Pope, and he was finally driven to subscribe to all the conditions which the Pope was pleased to impose upon him.

Not only did the papal power presume to hurl its thunders of excommunication against individuals and Kings, but against assemblies of people, for whatsoever purpose met together. It is interesting to note, in the same reign of John, that after the disgrace of the King, the Barons met and adopted "Magna Charta." But the Pope, (Innocent) "considering himself as feudal lord of the kingdom," issued a bull, in which, from the plenitude of his Apostolic power, and "from the authority which God had committed to him, to build and destroy kingdoms, to plant and overthrow," he annulled and abrogated the whole charter, and pronounced a general excommunication against every one who should persevere in maintaining such treasonable and iniquitous pretensions!

These historical facts show not only the grasping and aspiring inclinations of the Pope, but prove the absolute supremacy of his temporal power as it existed in the thirteenth century. Similar scenes and similar struggles to these already described in England, were of continual occurrence in all the countries in which, at that day, the Romish Church had foothold! It needed but little—a slight offence was sufficient to cause this arrogant Pontiff to turn loose his anathematic bull! and the furious animal, blinded with a thousand curses, rushed madly amid the indiscriminate masses of mankind!

It seems strange to us of this age—nay, sir, we are astounded—when we look thro' the telescope of centuries, and behold afar off, in a dim chamber, a feeble old man, alone as it were, holding his court amid the deserted ruins of an ancient city, without an army, without a fleet, without a sword, weighing in the hollow of his hand the

mighty empires of the world. Conquering mankind with no weapon but arrogance, with no power but the all-invincible superstitions which surround his throne!

And, to uphold this arrogance, he had his faces of brass, and his arms of iron, in every nation; and to spread this superstition, he had his cowed emissaries prowling all over the face of the earth.

And these cowed emissaries, who were they? History, with its burning scroll, declares them to have been the most degraded and degrading of mankind, given to all the sins and iniquities that human flesh, in its weakness, is given to.

But, it is said, there is no more danger of the encroachment of Popery. The Reformation redeemed men and kingdoms.—The nations of the earth are freed from the chains of superstition; and the Pope is now but a sort of innocent father confessor to the priests. Sir, be not deceived. When the lion sleeps, who is so foolish as to approach him in his slumbers? A mouse has too much sagacity to approach a sleeping cat, as if in its small cranium could be crowded the grand idea "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." The Reformers prevailed. The Pope surrendered nothing. He retired in sullen silence to the gloomy recesses of the Vatican, to brood over his fallen fortunes; to frame new forms of curses; to learn how to damn with intense gusto, and to mingle the wine of the Sacraments in the ink with which he wrote his anathemas, in imitation of one of his infallible predecessors. No, sir, the Pope was not dead; "the snake was scotched, not killed."

True it is, sir, that the "thunders of the Vatican" no longer shook the corners of the earth. The Pope sat in his quiet court, seemingly feeble in every respect, as if waiting for a gentle and immortalizing martyrdom. He who had yesterday been the builder of kingdoms, the maker of monarchs, and the destroyer of constitutions, was now the weakest of mankind. But we find him shaking his puny arm over Henry the Eighth, and grinding his teeth at Queen Elizabeth.

Impotent old man! He could find but one man in England who had the temerity to circulate his excommunication of Elizabeth.

But the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania disclaims for himself, and for certain colleges and councils, that the Pope claims any power to depose or interfere with monarchs, or to absolve their subjects. His personal disclaimer can amount to nothing except so far as the gentleman himself is concerned. The disclaiming of the colleges and councils amount to nothing except so far as the individuals are concerned who compose the colleges and councils. Besides being in the face of the historical acts of the Romish Church for six or eight centuries, they are positively contradicted by the legal Catholic book of De Maistre.

The English editor of De Maistre's profound work claims "The temporal throne as the patrimony of the Galilean fisherman." (St. Peter.)

The bull which excommunicated Henry IV., claims the power expressly "ex parte omnipotentis dei."

The bull of excommunication against King John, the interdict laid upon England and the Magna Charta, expressly claim, by words, the power as given by God to St. Peter, "to build and pull down kingdoms."—Hume, 299.

If the power was given by God, what right has the pope to surrender it? He would be faithless to surrender it. "He is infallible," says the Church. Therefore he cannot err. Therefore he cannot surrender a divine right. Therefore he has not surrendered it. Therefore the proposition of the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. Banks,] "that the Roman Pontiff has never, in authoritative form, disclaimed the right," remains still to be answered, notwithstanding the complacency of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The colleges may be allowed to publish what they please, so long as they stick to the interest of the Church, for the time being, and so long as they promote the interest of the Church in the particular place where questions may be discussed. The Pope will not call them to account, until the interest of the Church should make it

necessary to denounce their heresies. When that becomes necessary, the Pope will act and denounce their colleges, and excommunicate and damn all who presume to utter such doctrines. This would be in accordance with the history of the Romish Church. The councils of the Romish Church are in the habit of condemning the doctrines and decrees of the preceding councils. What can be considered stable in that Church, sir, which does not scruple to condemn its own Pope as a heretic long after he is dead! A general council, which Bishop England, in a letter read by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, declared to "be infallible in doctrinal decrees," condemned Pope Honorius as a heretic!—and some of his doctrines as heretical! If they can condemn a dead Pope as a heretic, what may they not do with persons, colleges and bishops! Honorius as a Pope, being infallible, must have gone to heaven upon his death. The Romish Church inculcates the idea that the Pope is bound to go to heaven. But, sir, in the case of Honorius, the council pronounced him a heretic (while he was in heaven,) and as a heretic cannot go to heaven, the council, of course, put him in purgatory, by their decree of condemnation!! and this Church, by their decree, virtually denies the powers of Jesus Christ to keep this heretical Pope in heaven. Sir, how long will it be before St. Peter shall be condemned for his old sin of denying his Master? How long is St. Peter safe in the bosom of his Lord? He will never be safe, sir, so long as the Romish Church shall presume. I have no doubt he is alive to serious apprehensions. I have no doubt that since the condemnation of Honorius, his immortal soul has been jarred every time the cock crows.

I propose no law to invade the sanctity of the Roman Catholic altar—or to touch, with rude hands, the sacerdotal robe. I invoke public opinion. I would expose its absurdities, rebuke its idolatries, ridicule its mockeries. Sir, to see the unlettered PERUVIAN bowing and kneeling to the sun, and worshipping it as the Great God of light—an admitted omnipotence—is not surprising; nay, sir, there is something awfully solemn, grand and ennobling in the superstition. It exhibits the open and humble admission of an over-ruling Divinity. But to see the best educated men of the country bowing down to images and baptizing bells, to scare away, with their sounds, the evil spirits of the air, is, indeed, humiliating.

Sir, we do not wish our children taught that a bell can scare away the devil. We wish to teach American wives that their wives are their only confessors; American children that their fathers and mothers are their only confessors. To correct these evils we invoke public opinion, and proclaim that we intend to practice party proscription. We ask no law; but give us a pure ballot box.

And let no native suppose that he has before him an easy task. The Roman Catholic Church has already acquired immense power in America. Their system is, never to relinquish an inch of soil.—They do not build log cabins to preach in; they make no perishable plank houses to preach in. They are not humble enough for that. They leave that to the heretical Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and others. In their swaggering pride, they forget that the fathers of the Church were "fishermen" and "tent-makers." When they build an edifice, its foundation is laid deep in American soil, and its spires rise high into the American heavens. They are already millions! This enemy is formidable. Then let every man go to work—let every Protestant be a sentinel on the watch towers of liberty.

"Boys," said a village pedagogue the other day, "what is the meaning of all that noise in the school?" "Why, sir, it is Bill Sikes, who is all the time imitating a locomotive." "Come up here, Bill Sikes; if you have turned into a locomotive, it is high time you were switched off."

The Central Ohio Railroad, according to the report of the President, loses \$85,628.01, by the failure of Gen. Larimer, of Pittsburgh. So says the Wellsburg Herald.

## Humorous.

A SPEC.

A pedler of tin ware, who had been travelling from plantation to plantation, with his cargo of "notions," found but a limited sale for his lanterns, an article of which he had a large stock. In despair of getting rid of them, he offered them at what he called "a very reduced price," yet he found purchasers as scarce as clover in sand hills. At length a tavern keeper directed him to a farmer, who he said, was very much in want of the article. To the house of this ready customer went Jonathan, determined to get his trouble's worth out of him. The first person he met was the overseer, who was lounging by the side of the road, "You don't want to buy a lantern, do ye?" asked Jonathan. "Yes, though I reckon I do," returned the overseer; "how much mought you ask for one?"

"Only thirty-seven and a half cents." "Well, 'spose you gin me one." "The pedler accordingly gave him a lantern, and receiving his money proceeded onwards.

"You don't want to buy a first rate lantern, do you?" said he to the overseer's wife, who was washing clothes at the spring.

"Yes," was the reply, "Mr. B. has been wanting one this long while." Jonathan accordingly served her but one at the same price he had bargained with her husband for. At the barn, before he reached the farm-house, he met the son of the planter—"You don't want to buy no lanterns, do you?"

"I don't want one myself," replied the young man, "but I'll take one for father, who has been after one this long while."

Jonathan now pocketed another thirty-seven and a half cents, and became one lantern lighter. He now advanced boldly up to the house, and meeting the old lady at the door, immediately put the question to her—"You don't want to buy no first rate lanterns, do you?"

"Indeed, but I do," said the old lady, "my husband has been wanting one these six months past—and I'm glad you've come."

Jonathan accordingly deposited a lantern with her, and received in return another thirty-seven and a half cents. He now departed, almost satisfied with the spec he had made. At some distance from the house, in a field by the side of the road, he espied the old gentleman himself, and hailed him with the old question "You don't want to buy no first-rate lanterns, do you?"

"How much do you ask apiece?" inquired the planter.

"Fifty cents," replied the tin pedler, "and I guess that's cheap enough, considering they've come all the way from Connecticut."

"Well, I'll take one," said the old gentleman, putting his hand in his pocket.

"Hadn't you better take half a dozen?" asked Jonathan, "there's no knowing when a tin merchant may pass this way again? If you'll take a half dozen, I'll let you have them for thirty-seven and a half cents apiece." The planter took him at his word—and the pedler took to his route after having disposed of ten lanterns.

Harry Eskine, of a facetious memory, was retained for a female named Tickle, against whom an action had been brought. On the trial, he commenced his address to the court thus: "Tickle, my client, the defendant my lord." The audience, amused with the oddity of the speech, were almost driven into hysterics by the judge replying: Tickle her yourself, Harry! you are as well able to do it as I."

"What did you hang that cat for, Isaac?" asked the school teacher. The boy looked up and gravely answered, "For me-tiny, marm." He had fifty marks immediately put down to his name.

An English writer says, you can tell when you are surrounded by a dozen Americans by the following test: Three will be smoking cigars, and the other nine reading newspapers.